In a recent paper in *Ophelia* (October 1999) we described a new spionid polychaete as *Polydora neocaeca*. The new nominal species, a boring mudworm, was based on material from Rhode Island and has its own holotype, description and type locality (see paras. 6 and 10 of the application; Williams & Radashevsky, 1999; and comments by Drs Geoffrey B. Read and Mary E. Petersen in BZN **57**: 44 and 45, March 2000). We believe this to be the same taxon as *P. caeca* Webster, 1879, the name for which is a junior secondary homonym of *P. coeca* (Örsted, 1843), a tube-dwelling spionid.

In a single place in our paper (Williams & Radashevsky, 1999, p. 116) we unfortunately noted that '*Polydora neocaeca* is described to replace the permanently invalid name *P. caeca*'. This might indicate that we proposed *neocaeca* as a replacement name (nomen novum) for *caeca* Webster (and, in this situation, *neocaeca* would automatically have had the same type material as *caeca*).

To avoid any ambiguity we should like to clarify the nomenclatural status of *Polydora neocaeca* Williams & Radashevsky, 1999. The name was established as that of a new nominal species, and not as a replacement (nomen novum) for *P. caeca* Webster. We believe that *P. neocaeca* represents the same taxon as Webster described, but the synonymy is subjective and not objective.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hybognathus stramineus* Cope, 1865 (currently *Notropis stramineus*; Osteichthyes, Cypriniformes)
(Case 3131; see BZN **56**: 240-246)

(1) David A. Etnier

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1610, U.S.A.

I have read and am familiar with the application to conserve the specific name of *Notropis stramineus* (Cope, 1865) for the common North American minnow called the sand shiner.

Wayne Starnes and I (Etnier & Starnes, 1993) were aware of Mayden & Gilbert's (1989) recognition of the obscure and unused *Notropis ludibundus* (Girard, 1856) as an earlier name for the sand shiner, and had learned by personal communication with Prof R.M. Bailey that applications were in preparation to conserve both *Notropis topeka* (C.H. Gilbert, 1884) (mentioned in para. 10 of the current application) and *N. stramineus*. This information was made generally available to North American ichthyologists in the fifth edition of the checklist of *Common and scientific names of fishes from the United States and Canada* (Robins et al., 1991) (para. 5 of the application). In 1993 we followed Article 23b of the 1985 Code and retained the use of *Notropis stramineus* while the case was in prepartion, as did Jenkins & Burkhead (1994) for the same reason.

In my view a very few uninformed or deliberate recent uses of *Notropis ludibundus* as the name for the sand shiner (para. 7 of the application) should not be a concern in the Commission's decision. Nomenclatural stability is best served by retaining the name *N. stramineus* (Cope, 1865) and rejecting *N. ludibundus* (Girard, 1856).

(2) Bruce A. Thompson

Coastal Fisheries Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 39566-1560, U.S.A.

Royal D. Suttkus

P.O. Box 1560, Ocean Springs, Mississippi 70703-7503, U.S.A.

We support Reeve M. Bailey's application for retention of the specific name of *Notropis stramineus* (Cope, 1865), and the suppression of the synonym *N. ludibunda* (Girard, 1856) and possible synonym *Alburnus lineolatus* Putnam, 1863.

We made our decision on the universal use of the name *N. stramineus* since 1958 (para. 5 of the application) and to ensure nomenclatural stability. Additionally, because of the poor condition of specimen ANSP 2841 in the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, the lectotype of *N. ludibunda* designated by Mayden & Gilbert (1989), that is, part of the head missing, fins broken, uncertainty of place of origin (collection site), lack of pigmentation characters, pharyngeal teeth missing and the fact that it is an immature specimen, identification will continue to be questionable to some ichthyologists.

(3) C. Richard Robins and Frank B. Cross

Museum of Natural History and Biodiversity Research Center, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.

We write in support of the application by Reeve M. Bailey to conserve the specific name of *Hybognathus stramineus* Cope, 1865. This species, currently named *Notropis stramineus*, is one of the most abundant and broadly distributed of North American freshwater fishes and is widely treated in the popular and semipopular literature, including dozens of state and regional ichthyologies.

The name *Notropis ludibundus* has crept into the scientific literature (para. 7 of the application) but the use of *N. stramineus* is so widespread that to change this name would be a great disservice. We also note that the print runs of the popular literature are vastly larger than those of the scientific reports.

Although Cross & Collins (1995) used *Notropis ludibundus* in their revision, the senior author of that work is a co-author of this note supporting the conservation of *stramineus*.

(4) Robert E. Jenkins

Department of Biology, Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia 24153-3794, U.S.A.

I strongly support the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Notropis stramineus* (Cope, 1865) for the sand shiner. It remains entrenched. When writing the huge book titled *Freshwater fishes of Virginia* (Jenkins & Burkhead, 1994), I had to contend with the name *N. lundiundus* (Girard, 1856) that some upstarts tried to use to displace the name *N. stramineus*. I considered retaining use of *stramineus* to be much more in the interest of stability, and I still believe so.

I urge the Commission to conserve the name *stramineus*.